DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 167 SO 015 962

AUTHOR Grimshaw, Allen D.
TITLE Teaching War as a Social Problem. A Report on Soc101 at Indiana University. Resource Materials for Teaching.
INSTITUTION American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 82p.; For related teaching resources, see SO 015 958-968.
AVAILABLE FROM ASA Teaching Resources Center, 1722 N St., N.W., Washington, DC 20036 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Controversial Issues (Course Content); Course Content; Course Descriptions; Course Evaluation; Course Objectives; *Curriculum Problems; Instructional Materials; Introductory Courses; Postsecondary Education; *Social Problems; *Sociology; Student Evaluation; Teacher Evaluation; Tests; Undergraduate Study; *War; World Problems

ABSTRACT

One of a series of resources for teaching sociology at the postsecondary level, this volume discusses the background, problems, and course format for an introductory course on war as a social problem. Material is divided into seven sections. Section 1 provides an introduction to the course. Section 2 contains the instructor's personal background and reasons for teaching a course on war. Procedures for preparing a course on this topic are described in section 3. Choice of instructional goals, topics, and course materials is detailed. The following problems encountered in teaching the course are examined in section 4: student enrollment, problems of student expectations and knowledge, teacher problems, and reactions to course materials. Efforts to improve course reading materials are described in section 5. Section 6 examines two contrasting problems in organizing and offering a course on war: the apathy, negativism, and indifference of a number of sociologists on the one hand and the work of anti-war organizations on the other. The final section considers the future of courses dealing with controversial social issues such as war. Attachments include a course syllabus, copies of examinations, questions for a film series which accompanied the course, a course evaluation form, and a letter to Physicians for Social Responsibility. (LP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Corinne A. Bordier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TEACHING

WAR AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM

A report on Socl01 at Indiana University

Allen D. Grimshaw

Indiana University

TEACHING

WAR AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM

A report on Soc101 at Indiana University

Allen D. Grimshaw

Indiana University

The author is compiling a set of curriculum materials for courses on Sociology of War (and Peace) and would appreciate your contributions.

Documents distributed by the ASA Teaching Resources Center are not intended to represent the "official position" of the American Sociological Association. Instead, they constitute a medium by which colleagues may communicate with each other to improve the teaching of sociology on the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Copyright 1984: American Sociological Association

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments 4

1. Introduction 5

2. Personal background and reasons for teaching a course on war 5

2.1. a brief autobiographical note 6

2.2. immediate precipitating events 7

3. Preparing a sociology course on "war as a social problem" 8

3.1. goals 9

3.2. topical coverage 9

3.3. course materials 11

4. Teaching a course on "war as a social problem" 15

4.1. from fewer than expected to even fewer 16

4.2. unshared knowledge, unshared predispositions, unshared expectations 18

4.3. teacher problems—course problems 22

4.3.1. consensus and chaos—reactions to course materials 26

4.4. summary 29

5. The bibliographic project and other ongoing work 30

6. The war course "environment": two contrasting problems . 32

6.1. apathy, negativism and indifference 32

6.2. competing redeemers 38

7. Whither next? 42

Attachments

Sociologists must contribute to world peace movements . 43

Syllabus 44

Course examinations 60

Questions for film series 65

Course evaluation form 70

Letter to Physicians for Social Responsibility 75

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

All teaching is a cooperative venture, that reported here has been more dependent than most on inspiration, support, assistance and encouragement from a variety of sources. I am grateful to the Lilly Teaching Fellowship Program and to my own department for providing me with released time to prepare the course; Lilly also funded the services of staff from the Development and Special Projects (DSP) department of the Indiana University Audio-Visual Division and provided a small grant for purchase of course materials. Tom Schwen, Director of DSP and Mary Deane Sorcinelli Indiana University Coordinator for the Lilly Program were unfailingly helpful and encouraging. My "Lilly assistants" from DSP, Robert Ingram, Carolyn Usrey and, particularly, Kay Shapiro were consistently helpful and encouraging— their contributions to my teaching will have effects reaching beyond this course. The same is true of the counsel of George Juergens, a master teacher, my Lilly "mentor" and a sturdy friend.

Jan Stets, my "regular" departmental teaching assistant during the first offering of the course assumed principal responsibilities for the film series and managed both technical and logistic problems with an enviable assurance; I am grateful for that service and for other work on the course. I am grateful to the university Learning Reecources Program (Dean K. Gene Faris) for funding the bibliographic project, to Jennifer Sarin who is serving most effectively as my assistant in that project, and to Indiana University library personnel who have helped her in that work. Thanks are also due to those among my departmental colleagues who have provided a steady flow of citations and suggested readings.

I probably would not have taught the course had not Joe Elder and my other colleagues in the World Conflicts Section (WCS) of the American Sociological Association assigned me responsibilities in the WCS; I probably could not have taught the course without their continuing help and support. As I note below, the specific impetus probably came from my son's acceptance of the "inevitability" of nuclear war during his lifetime. I am grateful to him and to his classmates for their encouragement and suggestions, and to members of the course itself for theirs. These young people have been my "reason" for preparing and teaching the course; I will continue to teach it because of the support and encouragement some of them have given me.

Dozens of other people have provided encouragement and assistance; I cannot name them all. I suppose the "real" inspiration of the course is to be found in the behaviors of the military, political and industrial-scientific actors who maintain and enhance the threat of our extinction—I cannot bring myself to thank them for their roles—I can express the hope that young people around the world will act more rationally when they "take over."

1. Introduction: Different readers of this report will have varying degrees of familiarity with this course, i.e., why I decided to teach the course at this juncture, what my background in the area of war and peace studies (or, more generally, social conflict studies) is, what kind of course I wanted to teach for what set of students, what resources have been available for course preparation and teaching, what my actual experience with teaching the course has been, what sorts of plans I have for future course-related activities, etc. I have also been bothered, as some readers know, by more general questions about the bases of widespread student apathy about such courses—and that of both professional colleagues and the citizenry at large. I will take up most of these issues in the report which follows: many readers will find some sections of the report more relevant (and/or interesting) than others. I feel very strongly about both the course and the threat of nuclear war which precipitated my commitment to it; the result is a highly personal tone to the following. If that tone makes the report more difficult for some readers to assimilate, I am sorry; I find it difficult to distance myself from the problem.

2. personal background and reasons for teaching a course on war: My interest in social conflict phenomena is not a new one. In recent years, however, I have devoted myself primarily to study of language use in social contexts—I have justified this work (aside from its very considerable intrinsic fascination) with the rationalization that conflict processes are profoundly affected by language dimensions. I assume that readers of this report are already convinced that the threat of nuclear war is the problem of our time; I will not waste time by still another demonstration of that fact. I will say something, rather, about my own background in the arena of conflict studies, and about

the events which nudged me into the (modest) projects of teaching a course and of preparing materials for courses on the topic.

2.1. a brief autobiographical note: My undergraduate degree (Missouri, 1950) is in anthropology and sociology. I started my undergraduate work at Purdue in 1946 in classes swollen with returning WWII veterans; I continued it in an atmosphere of growing Cold War tension and our first experience of the nuclear threat. It was in this context that I made three major decisions in the two years after receiving my degree. First I decided that, much as I enjoyed my study of anthropology, the ability to affect social problems would be greater in sociology than in anthropology. (I had no illusions even then about having any substantial influence on the course of events; I simply thought that sociology was more ameliorative in its orientation.) Second, after considerable soul searching about the morality of marrying and bringing children into a world at risk of destroying itself, I decided that self-denial in this arena would have no effects on the world and opted for self-indulgence. Third, after similar protracted consideration of conscientious objection, I took the easy way out and served in the military during the Korean War.

Upon receiving my discharge I returned to graduate school (Pennsylvania) with the intent of studying social conflict. During the next few years I spent more time worrying about my survival as a graduate student than I did about the condition of the world (there were anxious moments when international tensions waxed—the beginnings of the civil rights struggle were momentarily more salient). My doctoral project was a study of social violence in the United States (urban race riots in the 20th Century—up to that time) which replicated my advisor's work on Hindu-Muslim violence. During the years

immediately following receipt of my degree (1959) I was deeply engaged in work on social violence, both writing and teaching in the area. In 1962 I took a long-delayed trip to India, intending to determine whether community conflict processes there paralleled those described by Coleman. In the course of my research in India I became deeply interested in problems of communicative non-success; following my return I turned increasingly to study of language (including language in conflict) and ultimately gave up teaching courses on social conflict theory. My involvement in the world conflicts issues of the rest of the Sixties and through the Seventies (i.e., the continuing nuclear threat and Vietnam) was more that of citizen than that of working scholar.

2.2. immediate precipitating events: I joined the World Conflicts Section of the American Sociological Association shortly after it was founded in the mid-Seventies; I was not an active member and regarded my membership as an endorsement of the Section's goals (I maintained membership as a salve to my conscience— much as many of us give money to political campaigns rather than committing time). In 1980 Joe Elder asked me to run for the elective office of chair of the section. I told him that my current work was not very germane to the concerns of the WCS; he nonetheless persuaded me to run, he may well have anticipated that I would be drawn into Section activities as I have been. I have described in the first attachment, which many readers have seen before, a first consequence of my election—I asked my younger son whether he believed there would be a nuclear war in his lifetime and he replied, "Of course." In part because of that response and learning from WCS colleagues that it was widely shared by other young people, I agreed at our next WCS meeting to assemble syllabi and bibliographic materials for a teaching "package" on world conflicts for the Teaching Resources Center of the ASA. This last project,

now ongoing for more than three years, proved to be considerably more difficult than I had anticipated, I will note some of the reasons why in later sections of this report. I soon decided that the best way to get a manageable handle on the materials would be to teach an undergraduate course on the topic. During the past two years I have spent considerable amounts of time on the preparation and teaching of a "war course" and on preparation of a teaching package, the amount of time available increased when I ended my term as WCS chair at the Detroit meeting (1983). I taught an initial offering of the course in the 1984 spring semester; intensive work on the teaching package is now ongoing. (I am grateful for support for both projects. Course preparation and teaching was supported by a Lilly Teaching Fellowship; work on the teaching materials is being supported by the Learning Resources Center of Indiana University. I am deeply indebted to my history department colleague, George Juergens, who has provided valuable counsel and much needed support as my Lilly "mentor.") I turn now to descriptions of and some observations about my experiences with the two projects.

3. preparing a sociology course on "war as a social problem: There is certainly no shortage of materials on war or, more specifically, on the contemporary nuclear threat. My initial problems were to decide: (1) what my goals were in teaching the course; (2) what topics should be included in a course on war as social problem ,and; (3) what sorts of materials on those topics would be most useful to the students likely to enroll in such a course. None of these problems proved easy of resolution. I will say something about each in turn, expanding my remarks on the "useful-for-what-students" question into a summary of what happened last semester.

3.1. goals: I have had two primary and several ancillary goals in teaching the course. First, I wanted to "raise the consciousness" of those students who are either unaware of the nature of the current crisis or only vaguely aware, whether the low level awareness stems from ignorance, apathy or preoccupation with more (to them) immediate issues of social life, grades and "life after college." Second, I wanted to provide both these students and those who might come to the course with strong opinions (whether pro-"security," pro-"freeze," pro-survival, or whatever) with a sociological perspective toward these matters and information to address with that perspective. The course is a social topics course, not one on sociological theory; I hoped that students who took the course and perhaps never another would become better informed citizens.

3.2. topical coverage: S101 is a topical course intended to introduce entry-level students to a sociological perspective through examination of a specific social problem. This implies, first, at least some attention to the notion of "social problem" and to what is meant by a "sociological perspective." It further requires, in the case of a course intended primarily for entering level college students, coverage of a certain minimum of factual information about the topic addressed, attention to what various observers have said about the sources, costs and possible resolution of the problem, and provision of a critical apparatus for assessing the reliability and validity of factual claims and for making principled judgements about proposed solutions and their possible risks and benefits. In the case of "war" as a social problem this further implied attention to the generic phenomenon and not solely to the current nuclear threat; at the same time, the emphasis on the social problem dimension seemed to me to imply focus on the contemporary

period rather than on the "history" of wars and warfare. Finally, since the course was offered at the introductory level, it seemed necessary both to balance theoretical and interpretive materials with a heavy dose of substantive information and to broaden the interpretive base by drawing on insights from the humanities and not just on what social scientists have had to say about conflict.

The syllabus attached to this report includes a course description and specification of required work, grading procedures, etc., a synoptic outline of topics to be covered, a list of reading assignments, and a description of and schedule for the film series which was part of the course. A review of the synoptic outline will tell the reader several things about topical coverage in the course—or at least something about my intentions as the course began. First, there are four general sorts of topics covered: (1) general considerations of the concepts of social problem and sociological perspective, (2) questions related to understanding of war as a social and cultural phenomenon and as an historically rooted and continuing feature of human social life, i.e., what are the sources of war and conflict? are conflict and war inevitable? who fights? why?, etc., (3) issues more specifically associated with our collective entry into the age of nuclear weapons, i.e., what are the differences between "conventional" and nuclear war and what are relationships between the two varieties? how much war is there in the world today, and what are its costs, risks, etc.? what is the "arms race"? how might it be stopped? what is "national security"?, etc., (4) problems and concerns of a more speculative and philosophical nature, i.e., what sorts of world futures are possible, probable, achievable? what costs are acceptable for survival of the species? what are individual and collective (group and national) responsibili-

ties for understanding and addressing war as the social problem of our time? The same review, in conjunction with an examination of the list of reading assignments, will disclose that coverage of the several sorts of topics varied considerably in comprehensiveness; this variation reflected both my own schizophrenia about topical salience and differences in availability of accessible resources in the several topical areas. As if often the case, moreover, topics scheduled toward the end of the course were likely to get compressed coverage in both lectures and discussion and day-to-day developments in lecturing and in expressed student interests resulted in emphases and de-emphases of scheduled topics, the dropping of some, and the introduction of others. I will note below some student commentary on topic selection and emphasis. Comment and suggestions on this matter from readers of this report will be most welcome.

3.3. course materials: My experience in attempting to identify and assemble a collection of materials for the course which would meet criteria of topical appropriateness, accessibility to undergraduate students, accuracy and/or representativeness, interestingness, range of types of materials (i.e., fiction, non-fiction, film, simulations, etc.) and reasonableness of cost has often been frustrating. There have been two principal sources of frustration. The first, and the most manageable, was a consequence of my decision to try to incorporate what are for me new kinds of teaching materials. I noted my intention to use film (and video tapes). I had not used "movies" since my first years of teaching at Missouri thirty years ago; I simply had no notion of the complex logistics involved in mounting a "film series." I have been learning, with considerable help, how to manage scheduling (identifying nonclass periods for "showings" with minimal conflicts for students), locating and renting

films and tapes both on and off campus, the problems associated with video display (different tape sizes and speeds), problems of copyrights, etc. As I write this in June of 1984 an assistant and I are planning a schedule for the next offering of the course—in spring 1985; I discovered this spring that I had to rent films from commercial sources which are available through the university's own Audio-Visual Center because we did not make reservations in time. As I will note below, there are other problems, e.g., students disagree sharply on which films they find interesting and boring, some students will not attend showing unless attendance is taken, and many students complain about the additional time requirement; there were additional difficulties resulting from the poor quality of sound and image of some of the materials shown. Everything shown was selected to illustrate some particular point(s) or issue(s); I am sure some readers will have suggestions for improving the list.

I have seldom used fiction in courses taught in recent years. Three novels were assigned in this course, i.e., Maclean's, HMS ULYSSSES, Shute's, ON THE BEACH and Webb's, FIELDS OF FIRE. Student response was again highly variable—a number of students complained, for example, that Maclean's book dealt with obscure events to which they simply couldn't "relate." I continue to review candidate replacements (some of which have been suggested by students); suggestions will again be most welcome.

There are two additional "non-traditional" features I had hoped to incorporate into the course, namely, (1) games and/or simulations and (2) guest speakers. I was attracted to possible use of the former by the thought that they might help students to experience SOME sense of the enormity of the decisions which world leaders must make in crisis situations and of the ways in which any such decisions are embedded in situations which are manifoldly con-

tingent. I was interested in the possibility of having guest speakers because I thought students might gain a sense of immediacy on some issues if they were exposed to "real live" people who have strong views on matters discussed rather abstractly in some of their readings (or in lectures). In the event, I have thus far been unable to locate games or simulations which can be "played" by students without previous game or computer experience and which do not require long period of time for completion AND which are effective in facilitating the sense of involvement which would be the goal of such exercises. Suggestions will again be welcome; at this juncture I am not optimistic about effective use of games or simulations in a course already beset by problems of logistics and a high work load (from the viewpoint of most students). Guest speakers can make presentations during regular class periods; I may still try this in some later offering of the course—there are problems of time and scheduling which necessitate careful advance planning.

The second principal frustration I encountered in attempting to select appropriate materials for the course stemmed from the vast, complex, and widely dispersed character of the truly intimidating corpus of literature(s) on war and social conflict. My dissertation was a study of social (racial) conflict and violence in the United States, and during the 1960s I regularly taught both graduate and undergraduate courses on social conflict. During that same period I was a member of a faculty discussion group which read widely on topics of armament, the nuclear threat and world conflict. The courses I taught were primarily theoretical, however, and little of the reading done would have been easily accessible to entering level students. The studies we read in the faculty discussion group have been dated by the rush of events and the increasingly species- threatening nature of the nuclear threat. Exposition

of the nature of that threat can be found in publications across the full range of academic specialties as well as in government publications, technical and business journals, programmatic publications of groups of every imaginable political persuasion and more austere and objective books and article written by specialists but addressed to the general reading public. It is unlikely that even individuals who have committed themselves to full-time research on these issues have anything like control of the range of relevant literatures; no late-coming part-time student can possibly master them. There are, as I have noted, problems in deciding what topics and what literatures should optimally be SAMPLED for students. Once those decisions have tentatively been made, the problem of selection of materials for undergraduates is exacerbated by the necessity of identifying materials which are simultaneously informative, comprehensible and balanced (some of the clearest expositions are, unfortunately, some of the most biased).

While my excitement about my research on language topics had engaged most of my energies during the decade of the 1970s I had never completely abandoned reading on social conflict and as an interested citizen I had done some reading in the (primarily popular) literature on contemporary world conflicts and the nuclear threat. Following the conversation with my son reported above and my subsequent offers to prepare course materials and then to teach a course, I began to read both more broadly and more intensively. The more I read, the more overwhelmed and impotent I felt (in terms both of getting a "handle" on relevant literatures and by the threat itself). As the time for teaching the course neared I found myself almost immobilized by the necessity of selecting, ordering and assigning reading—there were just too many things I thought students should know about. At this juncture my Lilly "mentor," George Juergens

came to my rescue by telling me that I would never be able to assimilate the literature and that I should go ahead and select some readings and devote my remaining preparation time to planning lectures which would integrate whatever reading was assigned and fill in gaps in coverage, etc. He argued that the students themselves would help in evaluation of reading by identifying materials which they found particularly informative and useful—or difficult, redundant, biased, etc. His intuition was fundamentally sound, as will be seen below in discussion of student response, students have identified some reading as being particularly "good" or "bad." As I have already noted, most complained that there was "too much for a first-year course"; it is possible that in my attempt to at least touch upon all major issues I DID assign too much reading. It is clear in retrospect that some of the reading overlapped. It is also clear that some of the material assigned was too difficult. I am gradually locating more accessible treatments of difficult topics and am looking for places to reduce redundancy, etc. During the months immediately ahead I will continue to work on the reading; your help will be deeply appreciated.

4. <u>teaching a course on "war as a social problem"</u>: In part because of my own strong sense of urgency, I anticipated that I would have a strong enrollment in the course—I did not anticipate that it would be an Edsel. I knew that related courses were drawing large numbers of students at other institutions. The son who had told me that he expected nuclear war in his lifetime predicted that I would be inundated by concerned students. When eleven of his ex-fellow students from another university visited him last summer, they were uniformly excited about the course, offering suggestions for readings and films, asking reactions to materials they had found particularly informative, and engaging me and one another in discussion of a wide range of related

topics. They also predicted large enrollments. So did my mentor. Because of these predictions, and because I wanted to "test" different materials and approaches I arranged to teach two sections of the projected course, i.e., a limited enrollment honors section and a large (144 students) class. I looked forward to meeting with large numbers of interested and concerned students from whom I would both learn and draw encouragement. A few years ago some people were asking, "suppose they 'gave' a war and nobody came?" I found myself asking, "How does it happen that I am giving a course ON war and nobody seems very interested?" In the paragraphs following I will report on enrollments, on what I tried to do in classes, on student response in the classroom and on written student evaluations. I will close with some somewhat more encouraging aspects of an often unsettling experience.

4.1. <u>from fewer than expected to even fewer</u>: While notices about the course had been routinely sent to undergraduate counselors and advisors in several departments, our initial concern was that the enrollment in both sections would quickly be subscribed and that it might be necessary to turn students away. For this reason, admission to the honors section was made contingent on permission of the instructor and I planned on keeping class size manageable by telling "candidates" they would be required to help in further development of the course (e.g., by locating and evaluating additional materials, etc.). As the period for pre-registration approached and then passed, it quickly became evident that I need not have worried about turning interested and qualified students away—from either section. Only one honors student came to apply for admission to the restricted section; she did sign up— she subsequently dropped the course because her parents told her that a course on war would not help her in a business career. A second (non-honors) student ulti-

mately signed up for the course, claiming high interest and an ability to do whatever work might be required—she subsequently dropped the course because there was "too much work." The initial enrollment for the larger class was eighty students—some substantial proportion of whom enrolled because other sections were closed. Thirty-nine of these initial students dropped the course after the syllabus and reading assignments were distributed and it became clear to some who had not known it that there would be required film attendance. They were partly replaced by twenty "new" students, some of whom came because they had learned about the topic of the course—and some who came because they could not get into other courses. Staff monitoring course changes at "drop and add" reported that a number of students complained about the projected work load. I found this distressing both because of a general tendency to seek "easy" courses and because I had thought (naively, it now appears) that some students would find the topic so compelling that they would want, or at least be willing, to do the work. I am not unaware that students take more than one course, and announce when I distribute reading lists that I am not unaware that few students will do all the reading—I also tell classes that there will be enough choices on exam to enable those who have done a reasonable amount of work to find questions they can answer. (Copies of course examinations are appended, readers can judge the correctness of this claim.) Some students were apparently dissatisfied with the lectures, and additional students disappeared from class as the semester progressed—some turning up only to pick up examinations on days they were distributed and/or returned. By the time the semester was about two-thirds completed only about 30-35 students turned up on a regular basis. (I must admit that those who DID remain were often active, excited and full of observations, etc., about reading, films,

materials covered in lecture and events in the world in general.) Attendance at the "required" (I did not take attendance) film series declined even more sharply, by the last two "showing" no more than twenty students were appearing. I will note below some of the student explanations and responses to this decline in participation by themselves and/or their fellows.

4.2. unshared knowledge, unshared predispositions, unshared expectations: I was not so naive that I expected all of the students who appeared at class meetings after the initial sorting out process would be as well-informed, as concerned or as enthusiastic about learning about and talking about issues of war and peace as my son's schoolmates had been during their visit. I was not unaware, either, that WWII was for most students an ancient and honorable struggle in which their grandfathers might have participated and Vietnam an issue which had exercised adults around them as they were just becoming aware of the world around them. Indiana lies in the conservative heartland, and I anticipated that there would be contingents of both militant "hardliners" and Moral Majoritarians in the class—along with "freezers" and perhaps even a sprinkling of "unilateral disarmers." I also expected, however, that the continuing massive coverage of world conflicts, of issues of "national security" and of the nuclear threat in both the electronic and the print media would have made some impact on most students and that the vastly improved offerings in social science and history in contemporary secondary schools would have left many of them with a more developed historical sense than had been the case when their parents were undergraduates a generation ago. I knew that at least some students would find (or would already have found) the prospects of nuclear warfare so threatening that they would have suppressed consideration of such prospects and focused instead on more immediate goals of academic and

social success and longer-range occupational and career goals. I thought, however, that at least some of these students would be eager to learn some facts, to find out something about projected solutions as well as continuing dangers, even perhaps to acquire some insight into possible points of leverage where they and their fellows might effect, however slightly, their own destinies.

I have no basis for assessing the representativeness of this class as a sampling of college students, let alone young adults. I can say, however, that I have seldom had a class so attitudinally heterogeneous with regard to a course topic—or one in which some of the attitudinal sets were so solidly imprinted. I will simplify an extraordinarily complex situation by very roughly glossing some "types" which seemed to me to be revealed by students' actions including, e.g., written answers to test questions, comments in class, evaluations (written and orally offered) of course materials, patterns of class attendance, and evaluations of the course (collected from both fixed-response and open-ended questions administered twice during the semester by my "Lilly assistants"). My rough estimate is that between a half and two-thirds of the class came to the course with strong opinions about the course topics. There were four sub-groups within this set of students, i.e., (1) religious fundamentalists; (2) "hardliners" of varying degree, generally agreeing on Reagan- Weinberger policies but differing on, e.g., "first strike" versus "massive retaliation"; (3) combined fundamentalist-hardliners of a Moral Majoritarian orientation, and; (4) anti-war militants espousing a variety of positions. A second collection of students, possibly half of those remaining (but possibly more than half) included students essentially unwilling to learn about (think about? worry about?) facts or issues associated either with war in general or, more particularly, the nuclear threat. It seemed to me that

therewere two sub-groups within this set, i.e., (1) "true" indifferents, i.e., individuals who have either suppressed awareness of the issues and oriented themselves to "more immediate" personal problems and goals and; (2) "deniers," i.e., individuals who take a position which might be glossed as, "I don't know anything about all this and I don't want to know and don't tell me!" The remainder of the class (and the smallest proportion) was constituted by students who either really didn't know very much and had not formed opinions—but were interested in learning—or by students who were concerned, sometimes very concerned, but who considered themselves uninformed and "ready-to-learn." The first of these latter sub-groups might be called the "clean slates"; the second the "worried and open-minded" or "eager to learn."

Viewed from the perspective of the very rough taxonomy just outlined, I suppose that my goals in the course were to provide the "worried and open-minded" and "eager to learn" students with a body of data to consider and with some ways of thinking about the information provided— and to move class members initially located in other sets into that same sub-group. While I would like to believe that I achieved some success with the first goal, there is little evidence that there was much movement out of the "ideologically pre-committed" or "indifferent" and "denier" categories. I asked a question about the inevitability of war in general and of nuclear war in particular (as noted, exams are appended)—a not insignificant number of students cited the bible as evidence that war IS inevitable. I asked a question to provide arguments that war is necessary for progress and to then cite counter-arguments—a not insignificant number cited the benefits of war in population control (!) and technological developments and only reluctantly agreed that there might be other means to those particular ends than war. A student in a voluntary dis-

cussion session continued to argue the "ruffian invading your house" position as a justification for the escalation of "conventional" warfare with nuclear response, "massive retaliation" and "first-strike" even though his fellow students cited a range of reading materials with counter-arguments—he concluded with the assertion that he WOULD rather be "dead than red." Some students glowered at me during lectures in which I offered positions counter to their own; some of these same students wrote answers in which they said things such as, "You'll probably give me a low grade for this—but I have to tell the truth," etc. One student came up after a showing of Falwell's, BLESSED ARE THE PEACEMAKERS and said, "This is a wonderful course and the films are good and Dr. Falwell's is the best of all and I am persuaded by what he says—and thank you." She was followed by another student who told me that I could be in trouble for violation of the principle of church and state and that I had done a disservice to innocent students by allowing Falwell to corrupt them. Other students didn't like other films, complaining that they were "too bloody" (CULLODEN) or that they didn't like the swearing (THE BOAT), or that they didn't believe that children should know about the nuclear threat (IN THE NUCLEAR SHADOW) or that films like WARGAME, HIROSHIMA- NAGASAKI or THE LAST EPIDEMIC were shown "just to shock us." Disaffection, disagreement and boredom were manifested through each of the varieties of behavior listed earlier (i.e., evaluations, answers, attendance, disattention, etc.).

Having reported some disappointments, I should note that there were some brighter spots. One student who had been something of a hardliner reported going home and arguing with his similarly pre-disposed parents and brother that the Soviets were no less scared than we—and not without some justification. A student who had complained about the showing of BLESSED ARE THE

PEACEMAKERS reported in her final evaluation that she realized that it was necessary to introduce students to a full range of perspectives (she still didn't like his position). Another young woman, who reported that she "hadn't really thought about all these things" before taking the course wrote a letter to the editor of her home town newspaper about the need for increased awareness of the nuclear threat (she reported that the editor wrote back, praising her letter but stating he couldn't publish it because people in her home town "weren't interested in such things"). Perhaps more importantly, an increasing portion of answers with each passing examination showed familiarity with reading and class materials AND an ability to think critically about them; towards the end of the semester I began to get some really first-class papers. Some of this improvement doubtless resulted from a cumulative effect of reading and film-viewing which compelled students to think about what they were learning. Some of it may have resulted from changes in my lecture presentations which I initiated on the basis of diagnostic counsel from my "Lilly assistants" based on their observations of the class and the evaluations they collected. I turn now, briefly, to a description of the useful help I received from these advisors.

4.3. teacher problems—course problems: I have been teaching for more than thirty years. Like most university level teachers in this country, I never received any formal instruction in pedagogy. While I have jointly taught courses perhaps ten or a dozen times, and while colleagues have occasionally visited my classes, my classes have never been visited for purposes of peer evaluation and I have seldom received either feedback or counsel on my teaching from my peers (like all of us, I have received both solicited and unsolicited feedback from students). While I have routinely asked students to

complete self-administered teaching evaluation instruments and have often asked for detailed feedback on particular aspects of courses (especially readings), I had never until this year invited specialists into my courses to administer such instruments or to observe my teaching. I had long been aware of a bimodal distribution of evaluations of my teaching in lower-level courses with larger enrollments; since better students have consistently given me higher evaluations I have found easy rationalizations for my lesser success with discontented students. I have also long been aware of sharp discrepancies in the amount and quality of classroom discussion in upper level and graduate courses and lower-level courses with larger enrollments; I have again found easy rationalizations in assessments of student "quality" and interest. I have in short, basked in reflected successes of my best students, accepted as deserved such accolades as I have received, and "explained away" my failures.

My Lilly assistants visited the two courses I was teaching in the fall before the spring (1984) offering of the war course and both observed and administered a teaching evaluation instrument; they followed up these visits with helpful review and discussion of their observations and of statistical summaries of the evaluations. The fall courses were a small upper level undergraduate course (with an actual majority of graduate students) and an entry level social problems topical course (on language). There were few problems with the advanced course; there were many in the entry level course. First, my visitors confirmed my sense that my attempts at generating discussion were not being successful and that students were unhappy about this failure. They also reported that non-trivial numbers of students complained about the amount of work, of uncertainties about where the course was going (and on any given day, where it had been), of difficulties in determining what was "most important,"

and about my inability to "take appropriate action" when they were bored. Most seemed to feel that I was enthusiastic about the course topic, that I asked thought provoking questions, and that I made clear the "real world" significance of the topic—and its value implications. Readers who know me will not be surprised that students reported no trouble in hearing me.

My assistants offered two varieties of concrete suggestions. First, they reported that when I asked the class questions I ordinarily waited less than one second before "giving up" and myself answering them; they claimed that my pattern was more rather than less typical (studies in the conversational analytic literature report that gaps of more than a second are rare in less structured conversations). They also reported that I routinely waited longer in the upper level class— and attributed to that difference much of my greater success in generating discussion there. I was initially skeptical but made a self-conscious attempt to wait longer; I have been amazed at the results, which have been in the direction they predicted. Second, they suggested that I provide more ongoing structure in the form of outlines on the board (or in overheads, etc.) and in more explicit introductory and closing statements for individual class sessions. I am still working on this; there has been a less obvious change in class response. They were less able to offer resolutions for other problems, most particularly that of how to manage the presence, in the same class, of well and ill prepared students with varying levels of native capacity, previous training and experience, interest in the course topic, willingness to work, etc. This is hardly surprising, there are constraints of heterogeneity in the student population, of class size, of available assistance, etc., which make this problem essentially unresolvable (although thee are some classroom teachers of great skill who manage the prob-

lem with very considerable success). I did not find all of their suggestions equally useful; the important point is that they offered their observations, knowledge of literatures, etc., without pressing their views on me. One very helpful outcome of my experience has been, I believe, a realization that "education" people can be very helpful--and that small changes in classroom practice can produce major changes in effectiveness—for experienced as well as for novice teachers.

During the spring (1985) when the war course was finally taught, my "helpers" visited the class twice for observation and twice to administer the teaching evaluation instrument and interview students; they also arranged to videotape a class session. In addition I asked students to complete evaluations of assigned readings and films and requested "A" students to provide written comments on how the course might be improved. The results of this mass of evaluation data are not unambiguous; there are both encouraging trends and persistent problems. My sense that attempts to generate classroom discussion became increasingly successful was validated by both student evaluations and reported observations of the class; my assistants gave me "good marks" on the discussion in the videotaped session. Students also reported increasing satisfaction about the "thought-provoking" character of assigned materials and class activities. At the same time, students continued to express dissatisfaction about my ability to make the topic of the course "exciting" (or for some, even relevant. Towards the end of the war course one student in four of those responding assessed the course as "irrelevant in terms of the directions my life is taking"!), about the organization of the course and, particularly, about the difficulty of assigned work and examinations. While several more successful students rejected the assessment that the work load was burdensome,

even they disagreed about the relative value (for course purposes) of assigned materials. In concluding this section, I turn now to a brief description of student reactions to course materials.

4.3.1. consensus and chaos--reactions to course materials: A copy of the evaluation form for reading materials and titles in the film series is attached. Given the heterogeneity of the class, it is perhaps surprising that there was as much agreement as there was about assigned materials. Reactions to individual items are doubtless also influenced by the period in the course during which they are assigned (or shown); some students may develop a knowledge base and an interest over time, others may become increasingly disenchanted--or find themselves more and more pressed for time. These several problems were exacerbated in the war course by the fact that there were substantial delays in making some assigned reading available at the bookstore and by the fact that some students did not learn about the "required" film series until after they were in the course--and resented it. Problems in assessing evaluation of films and video programs are further complicated by the fact that some of the materials were technically defective, with bad sound and/or picture, etc. Problems in assessing evaluation of reading are further complicated by the fact that there was also overlap in some of the books--and that some of the articles were technical and difficult to read. All of these evaluative dimensions should be kept in mind in interpreting the summaries which follow.

The three most "popular" books were Bender, Sivard and Webb; a number of students also reported a favorable response to Shute. Many students reported that the similarity of rhetoric and apparent perceptions of the nuclear threat which emerges from Bender was entirely new to them; several found it upset-

ting. Similarly, many students reported that Sivard made them think about a dimension of the armament race they had never considered. While many students reported that they liked Webb because it gave them a sense of how it is to be in combat, I suspect that others enjoyed the opportunity to read a novel in a sociology course. The book which drew the heaviest "don't like" response was Schellenberg, students complained that it was "hard," "dry," "boring," etc. A significant minority reported that it was boring and/or hard to read but very informative. A still smaller minority characterized it as the most useful reading (or, with Bender, the most useful). I had included Maclean because it seems to me to provide an excellent portrayal of the stresses of combat and of reasons why people go "beyond valor"—it was probably a close second in "don't like" responses. Some students were unable to purchase it, among those who read it many reported it was boring (!) or that it didn't seem "relevant." Fallows was not popular. Some students reported that they liked either Wieseltier or Zuckerman; several complained about overlap and few liked both. Among the minority of students who claimed to have read Levi, most reported neutrality or dislike; a very few students (mostly better ones) reported that they found it very worthwhile. Levi may have been in part a victim of being a late assignment. A very small number of students suggested alternative reading. Bender and Sivard are the only two books which are clear "winners"; I am considering new titles in both fiction and nonfiction (e.g., Freeman), I am not convinced that it will be possible to construct a list of books which will be informative and attractive to such varied students at the same time. I will describe below some further efforts in this direction.

Response to assigned articles was even more diffuse and difficult to interpret or summarize. The most favorable response as to the Shils-Janowitz

paper, to the three articles on atrocities (Duster, Opton and Smelser) and to the Beres, et al, feature; there was dissent on each of these. A small number of students reported finding the "nuclear winter" papers (Ehrlich, et al and Turco, et al) very informative; I don't think many students read these two papers with much care (they are quite difficult). Sagan has covered the same materials in a much more accessible piece in the FOREIGN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY—I will assign that paper next time the course is taught. I suspect that many papers were read by only a few students. Whatever, response was very mixed; I will continue to look for a more satisfactory collection.

As I have already noted, attendance at the "required" film series started low and then declined—only about twenty students or so attended the last two showings (some brought friends to see DR. STRANGELOVE). Of the three most popular films, two (STRANGELOVE and THE BOAT) were fictional, the other was FRONTLINE. To my surprise, CULLODEN was the most unpopular film—two-thirds of the students reporting either didn't like it or characterized themselves as "neutral." There was a strong bimodal reaction to Falwell's film; given the composition of the class this reaction was not unexpected. Almost as many students were negative or neutral as positive about HIROSHIMA-NAGASAKI; the modal response to KNOW YOUR ENEMY-JAPAN was neutrality. The reaction to most of the other films was generally favorable, though some students were negative about WARGAME because it was "dated" or "unlikely," some didn't like IN THE NUCLEAR SHADOW because they felt children shouldn't be told about the nuclear threat, and a few students particularly liked the fragment from Goodall's, AMONG THE CHIMPANZEES. Reasons for liking or disliking were as varied as the evaluations themselves. At least some students liked the two fictional films because they were "funny" (STRANGELOVE) or an "exciting story" (THE BOAT) as

saw the reasons I had in mind in showing them. Much of the negative response to CULLODEN was based on a sentiment that "all that was a long time ago and doesn't have anything to do with today"; some students reacted to poor film quality. Many students found KNOW YOUR ENEMY-JAPAN as irrelevant and/or unbelievable. Some students complained that HIROSHIMA-NAGASAKI was "too depressing." The NUREMBURG print was very bad, the film was very badly edited originally (I am considering using the fictional story of the trial, JUDGEMENT AT NUREMBURG instead— it is very long and I am not sure whether it raises the moral-ethical issues in the same way). Some students complained that attendance was not taken and that while there were optional exam questions on the films seeing them was not "necessary." Others found the time inconvenient. My own reaction after this initial experiment is that a film series on this topic CAN be very valuable. I will try it again. Next time I will have two showings and WILL keep some record of attendance. I will retain some of the titles; I will continue to look for better ones (lists continue to come in and a continuing search will be part of the bibliographic project described below).

4.4. summary: Fewer students than I had hoped and anticipated were interested in taking a course on war as a social problem; I believe an constituency can be built. Those who did enroll in the class were highly heterogeneous in interest in and knowledge of the topic, in ideological orientation, in learning skills and in willingness to work. Not surprisingly, this heterogeneity was reflected in a wide range of reactions to the course as a whole, to the work required, and to me as instructor. There were problems with the assigned materials and with my teaching practices. I will work on both sets of problems. The attempt to introduce "non-traditional" teaching materials, i.e., fiction and films, was at least partially successful. I plan to continue

offering the course and, at some juncture, to also offer an advanced course on the topic. I hope to improve the class; my goal will be to design and teach a course which will be attractive to and instructive for an increasingly wide range of students.

5. the bibliographic project and other ongoing work: It will be clear from the above that I have found the problem of identifying readings which are simultaneously optimally informative and balanced and accessible to unevenly prepared undergraduate students a particularly vexing one. It will also be recalled that I have volunteered to assemble a teaching "package" of representative syllabi and of "graded" bibliographic materials on war for the Teaching Resources Center of the American Sociological Association. It was the discovery that this task was far more formidable than I had expected that led me to volunteer to teach the course; that offer led in turn to further confirmation of the difficulty of identifying optimally useful course materials. Over the past several years I have used public announcements, professional networks, and previous compilations in an attempt to locate useful syllabi; I have not been very successful. During the same period I have done a considerable amount of not very systematic reading and other bibliographic search myself; it did not take me very long to discover (as I have reported above) that I would not be able to assemble a very useful bibliography in that way.

I am currently employing a full-time assistant in work on the bibliography project; her support and funds for computer-assisted reference searches (CARS) has been provided by a small grant from the Learning Resources program of Indiana University. The assistant is engaged in several simultaneous attacks on the bibliographic problem. First, with the assistance of the university library reference staff, she is using CARS to identify articles in

the periodical literature over the last twenty years or so (the time period varies according to file coverage), using such standard references as SOCIOLOGICAL ABSTRACTS and SOCIAL SCIENCE CITATION INDEX. In order to keep the output from these searches manageable we have constructed a set of topical controls similar to those employed in determining coverage in the course itself. About ten or twelve files will be searched. Second, she is using bibliographies and bibliographies of bibliographies on appropriate topics to identify monographic and more popular treatments of topics of interest in book form. Third, she is obtaining additional titles from shelf searches (guided by the LC classification), from the syllabi and bibliographies I have in hand, and from leads generated by other sources. She will also pursue suggestions provided by readers of this document. Where abstracts or reviews are available she is reading them and making preliminary judgements about appropriateness for inclusion of items in the projected bibliography; she is also collecting books (on a carrel) for my review. We meet regularly to discuss criteria of selection of items for more careful review and of criteria for rejection of other items. Short descriptions of items included will be incorporated into the final version of the bibliography; we hope that the bibliography can cover major topics by listing no more than 100 books and possibly twice that number of articles. If this task proves manageable and if funds permit, we would like to also generate a shorter bibliography of audio-visual materials. We are hopeful that the bulk of this work can be completed before fall; our success in meeting such a deadline will depend in part on how much potentially usable material is identified and in part on how much time each of us will have to spend in reading and evaluation of candidate items. Once again, your suggestions will be most welcome—even if they mean more work!

6. the war course "environment": two contrasting problems: My focus in this report has been on one individual's experience in offering a course on "war as a social problem." I turn, in this closing section, to two comments about the social context in which the course has been conceived, prepared, taught—and responded to by students. These features of the social context are: (1) the indifference and even negativism about research, teaching and social action on war among academics, students and citizens in general, and (2) the contrasting phenomenon of voluntary"anti-war" organizations competing for the attention, commitment, energies and dollars of that small proportion of the population which is concerned. I will comment on these two matters in turn—they are, of course, interdependent.

6.1. apathy, negativism and indifference: It is distressing but perhaps not surprising that public opinion polls continue to report that respondents continue to rank such problems as "inflation," "unemployment," "crime" and "medical care" are more important than "the nuclear threat" when queried about "most important issues." An analogous situation characterizes professional associations in the social science disciplines. In the American Sociological Association, for example, the Section on World Conflicts (WCS) struggles to maintain subscription of the 200 members necessary to retain section status while other sections have four or five times as many members (I sometimes wonder who and what medical sociologists will study when all the doctors and hospital are "blown away"); some professional social science organizations have no organizational home for members concerned with issues of war and peace. (Doctors themselves, of course, have an organization, Physicians for Social Responsibility, which is deeply concerned with the threat of nuclear war. Similar organizations flourish among engineers, natural scientists and

even businessmen. This apparent anomaly invites research investigation.) It can conceivably be argued that the explanation for citizen reaction lies in the fact that issues of purchasing power and safety and health are immediate and pressing "everyday" problems— at least in the absence of visibly threatening events such as the "Cuban missile crisis." (Curiously, the confrontation and turmoil associated with possible expansion of the war between Iraq and Iran current as I write this does not appear to have generated any such widespread sense of insecurity—at least in this country.) Such an interpretation cannot serve to explain the difference in response of social scientists and their "hard" science colleagues, however, or that between academics generally and some nonacademic professionals. Nor can it explain the actual negativism about work in the area of war and peace studies displayed in comments such as, "What are you doing this for?" (with strong overtones of "Why are you wasting your time?") or, "When are you going to get back to work on your own stuff?" with which I have been faced when I have talked about my interest in the war course.

The widespread indifference (and even negativism) about research and teaching on war among academics and the apparent apathy of many of our fellow citizens are professionally intriguing as well as morally distressing phenomena. I have heard speculative interpretations from professionals, interested citizens (including activists) and students; none are completely convincing and empirical foundations for the speculation are rare. (Thee are partial exceptions, e.g., in a recent number of the JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES; the published literature is generally neither empirically nor theoretical persuasive.) The current indifference and apathy are particularly remarkable when juxtaposed with the recent (to many of us) Vietnam response. (On this last, I

find quite unconvincing interpretations which attribute the greater student involvement and concern with the anti-Vietnam war movement to student fears of being drafted.) There are apathy and indifference about many dimensions of world conflict issues; the threat of nuclear war is more obvious only because of its intrinsically greater magnitude. The fact is, of course, that many other conflicts, whether invasion of Grenada or El Salvador or Afghanistan or precipitous commitments in the Middle East or tacit acceptance of the adventures of local tyrannies in Timor or Thailand or wherever, carries some threat of escalation.

In one of the course examinations (a set of exams is attached as an appendix) I asked the following question (itself constructed from several student questions):

> How do ordinary citizens (of varying socio-economic characteristics) appear to assess the nuclear threat? Why do some people seem to feel more threatened than others? What sorts of variables are influential in determining individual attitudes and behaviors related to the threat? CAN individuals influence the likelihood of nuclear disaster? Why, or why not? Suggest some evidence.

Several students wrote quite thoughtful answers to the several parts of this omnibus question and we subsequently spend a considerable amount of time discussing the topic in class. Among the issues discussed were additional questions and specifications such as: (1) What are "types" of response? (2) How do individuals initially get "sorted" into one or another type? (3) Under what circumstances do individuals mover from one type to another? More generally, this question became, "What makes people change?" (4) What makes societies change? In the course of this discussion students "discovered" notions such as "critical junctures" and a variety of change dimensions including "internal-external" and "gradual-revolutionary." It would take too long to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

review the entire discussion, I would like to share the typology we jointly developed:

A TYPOLOGY OF RESPONSES TO NUCLEAR THREAT

ACTIVE			PASSIVE	
Pro-"Security"	Pro-Disarmament	Indifferent		Apathetic
Deterrence	"Survivalists"			Powerlessness Denial
	Ignorance	Narrowly defined self-interest	Fatalism, Faith	

In addition to the questions noted above, students went on to ask about current distribution of the several types in this country, in the Soviet Union, among our allies and theirs and in other parts of the world. They expressed particular interest in the question of how individuals could contribute to moving others from type to type in the face of massive propaganda by governments and parties with vested interests of one sort or another. I could not and cannot answer their questions. Nor can I answer the question of why so little research appears to be done on this critical topic.

Many of us have speculated on the reasons for sociologists' (and other social scientists') apparent continuing collective aversion to research and

teaching on world conflict topics. In a moment of disgruntlement I suggested in my last "note from the chair" in the WCS newsletter that sociologists aren't smart enough to be aware of their own self-interest, or have very narrow (careerist) notions of self-interest, or are overwhelmed by the magnitude of the problem and stunned into apathy— or that some combination of such reasons keeps us from working in the area. Historically it was argued that some sociologists shied away from the study of conflict and conflict processes because of an identification of conflict with Marxist sociology—I have the sense that even our self- identified Marxist colleagues are not studying conflict very much other than in the workplace and in class or gender relations (this is hyperbolic, of course, there is some study of, e.g., relations of rich countries with those of the Third World). The problem (or what I see as a problem, at any rate) is not limited to explicit study of world conflict phenomena. There are sections on social psychology and on collective behavior in the ASA; members of those sections and other sociologists have historically been deeply engaged in studies of e.g., socialization, attitudes, social movements, etc. It would seem that studies of the distributions of the types of attitudinal sets hypothesized by my students in their exercise on responses to the nuclear threat, of the types of socialization experiences which sort people into the different types, of the critical experiences or continuing socialization which generates inter-type mobility and of the social movements which have grown up around the several attitudinal postures could reasonably be seen as work addressing theoretical issues close to the core of traditional sociological concerns. I would like to see sociologists and colleagues in cognate social science disciplines doing research on issues of world conflict. I would like to see these colleagues addressing the questions of value and atti-

tude acquisition and of collective behavior to which I have just referred. I would be delighted to see work on the sources of the avoidance behavior which leaves this work undone. Until these several sorts of research are initiated and carried through there will be many student questions which cannot be answered.

Work of the sort just called for can be justified on principled grounds of theoretical value. There are, of course, some considerably more pragmatic bases for work on these topics. A linguist colleague who has done important work on the social costs to speakers of their use of socially disvalued language varieties recently wrote:

> . . .To make a contribution towards improving education in the ghetto areas can't be taken as a substitute for the main issues. Not to work against nuclear war now is equivalent to marching into the gas chambers without a struggle.
>
> The strange part about the current situation is that we have always associated social action with being good. Primarily, because we were concerned with helping others. But the issues now have nothing to do with being good. They concern naked self interest. I have never been right about the political process, but it seems to me that the success of the peace movement must be coupled with divorcing it from good social action, so that those who are concerned primarily with themselves and their families will see what they have to do.

As another colleague used to say, "I couldn't agree with you more!"

6.2. competing redeemers: I have just remarked on my distress about sociologists' collective neglect of, and even apparent distaste for, research on world conflict and world conflict related issues. I turn now to a problem of a quite different order—one not of "not so benign" neglect but rather one of what sometimes seems to be a "surfeit of good intentions." In contrast to the small set (proportionate to their numbers) of social scientists engaged in research related to world conflicts, there is a large number of "anti-war" organizations on the national level in this country, and a much larger number of local branches and autonomous local organizations. Several of the national organizations are, however much they may agree on a shared goal of avoiding nuclear war, competitors for public attention and dollars. Some organizations which publicly espouse that shared goal propose radically different routes to its accomplishment; the peace programs of the American Security Council and of the Moral Majority differ sharply from those of, e.g., PeacePAC or SANE. Hardly a week goes by, however, that I do not get at least two or three mailings from organizations which fall into the "active pro-disarmament" cell of my students' typology. At times of crisis and when important legislative votes are pending the volume of mail increases markedly. These organizations do offer "marginally differentiated products" (i.e., some are "freezers," some "graduated reductionists" and "negotiators" and some "unilateralists") and some address themselves at least putatively to specific constituencies (e.g., physicians, scientists, social scientists, engineers, etc.). Most cast their nets very broadly, however, most solicit contributions, and many offer special publications.

It can be argued that the large number of these organizations is a healthy indicator of widespread concern; it can possibly be argued that only

through a proliferation of organizations with overlapping programs and constituencies is it possible to reach every potentially "activated" citizen. Whatever the merit of these arguments, it seems to me that there are at least two unfortunate consequences of the almost sectarian character of organizational proliferation, i.e., (1) a tendency toward simplification of extremely complex issues and (2) generation of an unmanageable mass of published material. The first of these consequences leads both to a dilution of energies and to systematic neglect of fundamental bases of conflict. Along with the second it also causes difficulties for the would-be teacher of courses on war. I will comment briefly on each of these matter.

At least six of the organizations from which many of us receive regular mailings (i.e., Common Cause, Council for a Livable World, PeacePAC, Physicians for Social Responsibility, SANE and the Union of Concerned Scientists) spend vast sums of money attempting to raise more money (for which they compete) on what are essentially single issue campaigns. This doesn't make sense to me for at least two reasons. First, even if it made sense to focus almost entirely on nuclear freeze and/or disarmament as they do, much of their money could be more effectively spent. Second, while it is critical to stop the nuclear arms race, the latter is more a symptom than a cause of our current unhappy world situation. The deeper problems are to be found in inter- and intranational economic, political and social inequalities, in poverty and injustice, in religious, philosophical-political and nationalist ideologies. People in fear of their own lives and those of their children will rally to a nuclear "freeze" (and, as we saw in the recent democratic primary campaigns, at least temporarily to a "freeze" candidate like Cranston); such a freeze, or postponement of the MX, or even some movement towards arms control

cannot bring peace unless there is simultaneous attention to the deeper causes of conflict.

"Evaluation research" is "hot" these days; it seems to me that the arena of national "anti- nuclear war" organizations could prove a fruitful site for work in the genre. I would like to see research on the "effectiveness" of organizations like those listed (and others with broader conceptions of the problems we jointly face). I.e.: (1) Are they effective in moving individuals into "their" cell in the typology? (2) Do they influence legislative outcomes? To what extent? (3) Would they be more effective if they cooperated rather than competed? (4) Would they be more effective in the long run if in addition to education (in their sense) and lobbying, they supported research on fundamental sources and courses of conflict? (5) If they supported education in classrooms from K-12 and through college? Organizational vested interests would have to be overcome before such research could be undertaken; I would hope that organizational decision-makers could be persuaded to let a shared goal of peace have precedence over narrow institutional interests. (I am, of course, an idealist—and naive.)

I have just complained that the major organizations in the anti- nuclear movement sometimes oversimplify issues; I complained earlier that they collectively generated an unmanageable mass of published material. It is further the case, however, that some of the organizations publish materials which are extremely informative and so written as to be accessible to undergraduate readers and/or which contain very useful information on other sources, on developments in the peace movement, and so on. Some of this material would be very useful for teaching purposes. While some of it is available at no or very low cost, however, some of it is quite costly. Two of the most useful periodi-

cal publications are the DEFENSE MONITOR (a review of weapons development issues published by the Center for Defense Information) and the PSR NEWSLETTER (of the Physicians for Social Responsibility). Each of the short serials carries an annual subscription charge of $25.00— as does the WORLD POLICY FORUM (of the World Policy Institute). There are also, of course, more traditional "scholarly" periodicals (e.g., the FOREIGN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY) which publish materials on the same topics; they also have regular subscription charges. Some of the "activist" organizations are willing to waive charges for those who "cannot pay"; others are not. Anything like comprehensive coverage of the mass of periodical publication, alone, would run into the thousands of dollars, and would be possible only for major university (or urban) libraries. Even the minimal coverage which secondary school teachers or college instructors might find necessary for regularly teaching a course on war could run to several hundreds of dollars—particularly in circumstances of limited library resources. And, availability to instructors may not mean, where large courses are the norm, availability to students. I had an exchange about this matter with the publications officer of Physicians for Social Responsibility; my last letter to her, which was unanswered, is attached.

The problem of acquisition of teaching materials is not limited to publications of activist organizations. Trade publishers are often slow in making available soft cover editions of fiction or nonfiction books which continue to sell well in hard cover. Some journals are "hard-nosed" about permissions for reproduction of their materials for student use. Owners and major distributors of films and television programs often demand high rental fees; these high fees are often nonetheless conjoined with restriction on use. Since the motivation of many of the original authors and producers of these materials

has been to educate their fellow citizens about the dangers of war, and about possible resolutions, etc., the intrusion of a profit motive is disturbing. Readers' suggestions about how this problem might be addressed will, again, be most welcome.

7. Whither next? This document is much longer than I originally intended; I have strayed some distance from a simple description of my experience in preparing and teaching the course. There may be few readers who have "stayed the distance" with me. To those of you who have, thanks. Writing out my thoughts and reactions has helped me, at least, to geget some better notion of what I have done and what I feel remains to be done. I intend to teach the course again (it is next scheduled for the spring of 1985); at some later juncture I may teach other related courses. I hope that increasing numbers of my colleagues will teach courses and do research on world conflict topics. I hope that my review of my own experience will be helpful to those individuals. I hope that the projected bibliography will also be helpful. I hope that some of the research issues I have identified will be addressed; I am trying to identify ways of making my own research more germane. Finally, I hope that readers, both academic and otherwise, will have thoughts on how some of the logistic problems I have discussed can be resolved. Comments on any and all of these matters will be most welcome.

Sociologists Must Contribute to World Peace Movement

Open Forum

A few weeks before I left Bloomington for my trip to San Francisco and the ASA Annual Meeting, I asked my twenty-year old son what he thought the likelihood was that nuclear war would occur in his lifetime. His answer was, "Oh, yeah," and in the course of our conversation I learned that he believed that some sort of nuclear disaster was probably inevitable, that it might happen "any time", but might be long-delayed, that he personally didn't think much about it because he didn't feel that there was anything he could do to prevent it, and that most of his friends feel much the same as he does. When I mentioned the conversation to colleagues in the World Conflicts Section (WCS) at the meeting, they told me that studies have shown that his view is widely shared by people his age (and many considerably younger ones), and that with the exception of a few youth (and childrens') groups, most American young people also share his feeling of impotence.

A publisher at the meeting was distributing bumper stickers which read, "Sociologists make better role models"; in matters of war and peace, we clearly do not. Professionals in medicine and law and our academic colleagues in other disciplines have been far more active than we in research, education and political action on all issues of WC. In recent months citizens from all walks of life have involved themselves in the nuclear freeze movement and other attempts to reduce threats to peace wherever they occur. A similar heightening in concern and citizen activity has been reported from other parts of the world—particularly Europe. President Reagan's angry and uninformed charge that sinister elements are manipulating the peace movement, and the close House votes on a nuclear freeze resolution (lost 204-202) and on maintenance of the MX missile program (won 212-209) show that a concerned and active citizenry in a democratic society can have an impact on issues which affect their lives in the most fundamental way.

None of us is so naive as to believe that a greater involvement by sociologists will cause the warning clock of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists to start spinning backwards. We can be sure, however, that without our involvement the likelihood of mutual obliteration will increasingly rise. It is our claim that we have special knowledge, and skills for acquiring knowledge, about behavior of collectivities and of individuals in social contexts. This knowledge, if indeed we have it, entails special responsibilities as well. Issues of social conflict or cohesion and of social organization and social disorganization are central to all of sociology—whether we study the family, crime, organizations, public opinion, electoral politics, the environment or *whatever*. A better understanding of WC would enhance sociological theory and research whatever the particular substantive focus.

Sociologists can contribute to peace in four ways: (1) more explicit attention to conflict in all of their teaching and research, and a willingness to identify the implications of their own work for WC; (2) teaching and research on WC themselves; (3) active involvement in peace action outside the academy, whether in political action or in educational activity or whatever; (4) through indirect financial and moral support when personal involvement is not possible.

From its beginning, the WCS has been marginal barely maintaining the minimum membership required to maintain section status. If only one ASA member in twenty could be persuaded to make contributions of the first two sorts and that their contributions could be enhanced through participation in an active WCS, we would have over 500 members. If an additional one in twenty were to join because of commitment to the second two kinds of contribution, WCS would be the largest ASA section, with more than 1,000 members.

A larger membership motivated by these considerations would have several effects. First, the quality and extent of special knowledge of WC (and social conflict more generally) would be enhanced—as would be our new members' understanding of their other areas of substantive concern. Second, more college students would be able to take courses on causes, processes of, and possible modes of resolution of WC. Third, and not inconsequentially, sociologists would thereby communicate to our government, our fellow citizens, and to sociologists in other lands and their governments, both useful knowledge and the depth of our concern about WC.

As I write this I can look out my window over the beautiful fall foliage of southern Indiana—and visualize an unpopulated nuclear desert. Is anything more important than preserving our world and its inhabitants? If we sociologists can contribute to that preservation, however modestly, it is morally imperative that we do so. Let us see what we can do.

Allen D. Grimshaw
Indiana University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ATTACHMENT 2: COURSE SYLLABUS

Spring semester, 1983-1984
Sociology 101: Social problems and social policies (sections 3914, 3919)
Topic: "War as a social problem."
Instructor: Allen Grimshaw
Schedule: 2:30-3:45 TR, Ballantine 109; by arrangement
Office hours: After class, in 842A, and by appointment
Phone: 5-3633 (Do not call me at home!)

Global nuclear war and the end of civilization as we know it (and possibly of humanity) is surely the major social problem of our day. Armed conflicts short of nuclear war exacerbate more familiar social problems such as crime, poverty, mental disorder, family dissolution, and so on. In spite of our collective knowledge of these facts, the species continues to engage in "conventional" wars--and the so-called superpowers to engage in behaviors which carry high risks of precipitating a nuclear "holocaust."

The purpose of this course is to examine war as a "social problem" and as a manifestation of conflict as a social process. Attention will be given to such questions as the sources (causes) of war (and, to a lesser extent, conflict more generally) and of whether war is an inevitable feature of human social life. Other topics which will be considered include: (1) who fights, and why; (2) conventional vs. nuclear war; (3) national security, and; (4) some possible "futures."

I have a bias. I am teaching this course because I believe human life is worth preserving. While some doubt this premise, those who share it often disagree on how best to resolve a wide range of ethical, political and technical issues. I will try to present some of these different perspectives--I make no claim to distinterested objectivity.

Much has been written about war; not all that is most germane has been written for university undergraduates. Because of this, some of the reading will be difficult. I have tried to cover as many of what I consider to be important topics as I can, for some issues there are no very satisfactory treatments which are easy reading. We can talk about difficult readings in class. I will assume, however, that unless you ask questions about the reading, you are understanding it. The following books have been ordered through Aristotle's and should be available there:

David Bender, The arms race: opposing viewpoints.
James Fallows, National defense.
Warner Levi, The coming end of war.
Alistair Maclean, H.M.S. Ulysses.
James Schellenberg, The science of conflict.
Nevil Shute, On the beach.
Ruth Sivard, World military and social expenditures.
James Webb, Fields of fire.
Leon Wieseltier, Nuclear war, nuclear peace.
Solly Zuckerman, Nuclear illusion and reality.

Please let me know if you have difficulty in purchasing any of these books. The other items listed in the reading assignment will be available as a reading packet; information on how the packet can be obtained should be available during the first week of classes.

There will be a film series as a part of the course. Attendance will be expected. Information on obtaining passes for the series is included with the attached schedule.

Course requirements and grading: All students will be required to take a midterm. This will be a take-home examination consisting of four questions (most of which will have alternates) and will be due in the seventh week. This examination will count for one-half the course grade; it will be turned before the deadline for withdrawal with an automatic W. There will be, in addition, five "mini" examinations, each consisting of one question (chosen from among two or more alternates), each again a take-home examination. You may count your four best scores; those who are satisfied with their first four grades need not take the fifth mini examination.

No extra credit will be given for taking the fifth mini examination; only the four best scores count. Students who have a "firm" grade after completing the midterm and four minis will probably be best advised to spend their energies in preparing for finals in other courses.

Earning an A Grade: An A grade represents exceptional performance. Students whose test performance is sufficient to earn an A either read an extra book and report on it orally or write a short paper (reading a book will be the preferred option in most cases). Fulfillment of this requirement is a necessary but not sufficient condition for earning an A grade; test scores must also be sufficient, and no "extra credit" will be given.

Released time: Since examinations are to be written at home; one or more classes will not meet during the semester.

Evaluation of required reading: Forms will be distributed early in the semester which will allow you to evaluate the usefulness, interest, level of difficulty, etc., of each assigned reading and of the films. You will have an opportunity to identify materials you find particularly valuable—or which you think should be dropped. (The fact is, however, that students seldom agree on what they like and don't like.) Completion of the forms is a course requirement; they will be due on the last day of class.

Office hours: I will ordinarily be in my office on class days. I will be glad to talk with you about readings, lecture materials, films, examination questions or almost any other topic. If those times are inconvenient, other arrangements can be made. I hope you will also ask questions in class; don't be intimidated if I don't seem to provide enough time for questions! You can also leave written questions in my mail box; pages help if you have questions about reading. I will also be glad to talk with you on the telephone; do not hesitate to call me at my office number.

The assignments listed are tentative and subject to (hopefully) modest change. Materials covered in lectures may be quite different from assigned reading at any given time. There will be some time to discuss the films and I will be pleased to discuss the reading. Please ask me if you have any difficulty in understanding the assignments, or in obtaining required materials.

SYNOPTIC OUTLINE

I. Introduction: the notion of "social problem" defined:

1. traditional views and examples.
   a. origins of sociology in ameliorative concerns;
   b. "original sin" versus "social evolution" versus "byproduct of capitalism";
   c. what is bad?
      i. crime, disease, poverty, discrimination, etc.
      ii. what would a "good" world look like?
2. traditional interpretive perspectives.
   a. individual defects versus institutional breakdown versus individuals in social systems, i.e.,
      i. crime, drugs, mental disease;
      ii. family disruption (divorce, etc.), "crisis" in education, economic depression (unemployment, inflation);
      iii. racism, sexism, agism.
   b. the micro-macro dimension:
      i. individual pain and aggregated social costs;
      ii. issues of generalizability across levels—the process question
3. some new perspectives on problems and sources.
   a. environmental destruction and depletion (Catton and Dunlap);
   b. dominance versus nurturance (Boulding).
4. war as the ultimate (major, inclusive and potentially final) social problem.
   a. as exacerbator of all other social problems;
   b. as "final solution" to all social problems.

NOTES

II. Sources (causes) of war and of conflict more generally:

1. human nature (?): innate characteristics.
   a. aggressiveness (bellicosity);
      i. frustration-aggression hypothesis;
      ii. social Darwinism;
      iii. "territorial imperative," ethology,
   b. greed;
   c. fear;
      i. rational;
      ii. falsely heightened by threat inflation.
2. human nature (?): secondary (i.e., learned) characteristics.
   a. nationalism-chauvinism (pride? "manifest destiny"?);
   b. ideology (political, religious, economic, ethnic, etc.);
   c. "honor";
   d. greed;
   e. fear;
      i. rational;
      ii. falsely heightened by threat inflation.
3. social organization and culture.
   a. cultural specialization (Yananomo? Tatar?);
   b. "traditions of violence" (frontiers?);
   c. cultures in conflict (colonization, mercantile expansion);
   d. economic systems in conflict (pastoralism versus sedentary agriculture, communism versus capitalism);
   e. religious systems in conflict (Crusades, jihad, Northern Ireland);
   f. political systems in conflict,
      i. pragmatic, i.e., colonial disputes over "spoils";
      ii. ideological, i.e., "democracy" versus "dictatorship";
      iii. conflicting despotisms (the world of 1984).
4. popular and unpopular wars: commitment, morale, patriotism.
5. analytic dimensions:
   a. internal-external (Simmel);
   b. continuous-intermittent (cyclical?);
   c. questions of intent--war by choice and war by error (i.e., communicative nonsuccess);
      i. nuclear war by "error" (see VI. 3.).
   d. war as a "game"--game theory, play;
   e. inevitable--not inevitable;
      i. arms race "spiral" versus ???

NOTES

III. Roles and players:

1. combatants: how many, who, how chosen?
   a. historical change in proportion of combatants to total population;
      i. inverse relation between combat proportion and weapon deadliness? cost?
      ii. homeland wars and wars in foreign lands?
   b. historical change in proportion of combatants to "support" arms?
   c. who fights, how chosen?
      i. military service as part of the social compact (a universal responsibility for fit, adult, "freemen")—a conscript military,
         (a) city states, feudal structures, modern nations;
         (b) social class, gender and competence as selection criteria;
         (c) exemption: purchase, essential civilian service, pacifism and conscience;
      ii. military service as desirable employment and as a route to social mobility—a mercenary (volunteer) military;
         (a) freebootery, elitism—"to the victor go the spoils";
         (b) social class, gender and competence as selection criteria;
         (c) postwar rewards (spoils?)—political office, veteran preference.
   d. leaders and followers;
      i. ascribed versus achieved;
      ii. "R.A." versus OCS;
      iii. "combat tempered" versus technical proficiency.

NOTES

III. (continued)

2. the military experience.
   a. willingness and ability to fight and kill;
      i. patriotism versus propaganda versus peer group pressure;
      ii. few trigger pullers, fewer aimers (see also 2.b.);
         (a) concomitant role of automatic weapons;
   b. dehumanization of enemy, "distancing";
      i. barbarians, infidels, savages, Huns, Japs, gooks, slants, etc.;
      ii. face-to-face atrocities—Carthage, Agincourt, Auschwitz, My Lai ...
      iii. long-distance killing (submarine warfare, gas, napalm, "saturation" bombing, etc.);
   c. fear, panic, selfishness and other socially disvalued behaviors;
   d. war as a "character" builder—where have all the virtues gone?
      i. altruism, bonding, chivalry, courage, discipline, heroism, honor, maturity, patriotism, self-sacrifice;
   e. post-combat experience;
      i. "remembrance of glories past"—veterans and lobbies;
      ii. unbenign neglect—Vietnam veterans and Irani hostage heroes.
3. civilians.
   a. supporters, dissidents and indifferents—patriots and profiteers;
      i. Simmel on conflict effects;
   b. blurring of combatant-civilian distinction;
      i. combat "zones";
      ii. wars of obliteration;
         (a) Carthage, the American Indian wars, Vietnam, nuclear war;
   c. disappearance of neutrality—"Harlan County" and "global struggle."

NOTES

IV. "Conventional" versus nuclear war:

1. changing view of conventional. World War I was seen as differing in both magnitude of costs (casualties, wealth)—and weapons employed (aircraft, gas, submarines) from all previous wars, and as so horrible that war could never again be contemplated. It is now seen as "conventional." A contrast is currently made between "conventional" and "nuclear"; a distinction is also made between "conventional" and "guerrilla" warfare.
   a. could nuclear war become "conventional"?
2. what is incidence of current (and recent) conventional wars?
   a. number: tens or hundreds, depending on criteria and counter;
   b. locations: primarily in the "Third World," e.g., non-exhaustively:

      Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bengal, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Falkland Islands, Guatemala, Grenada, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Katanga (Zaire), Laos, Lebanon, Morocco, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), Syria, Tibet, Turkey, Uganda, Vietnam, Yemen;

   c. the wars just listed (and others) have been variously labeled as:
      i. "civil wars";
      ii. "neo-colonialist (imperialist) wars";
      iii. "wars of national liberation";
      iv. wars between ideological (or superpower) surrogates;
      v. "weapons-testing arenas."
3. direct costs of conventional and nuclear conflicts.
   a. conventional;
      i. fatalities;
         (a) combatants;
         (b) civilians;
         (c) minorities;
      ii. future generations;
      iii. property;
      iv. environment.
   b. nuclear—estimates vary;
      i. "limited" versus "total" nuclear war.
4. indirect costs of military and social expenditure (Sivard. See also V.)
5. changing parameters of rationality:
   a. death of the "enemy" versus death of the species;
   b. living with the threat of extinction—apathy (and immobilization) or action;
      i. "imaging" futures (see VII.)

NOTES

V. Weapons:

1. from new weapon generates new defense to new weapon generates "counter deterrent"
2. "conventional" weapons—"more bang for the buck," or less "lethality" for more dollars?
3. nuclear weapons—how much is "enough?"
   a. the risk of "nuclear war by error" (see VI.3.).
4. the international arms trade.
5. arms industries in developing nations.

NOTES

VI. "National security":

1. what does it mean?
2. the debate, and the participants in the debate:
   a. "managers";
      i. military;
      ii. political;
      iii. defense establishment;
      iv. industry.
   b. "theologians" (Fallows);
   c. military leadership;
      i. military bureaucracies as "greedy institutions" (Coser)?
   d. politicians;
   e. activists;
      i. hawks (e.g., Moral Majority, American Security Council, etc.);
      ii. doves (e.g., "freezers").
   f. citizens;
   g. opponents (USSR, Warsaw Pact) and allies (NATO);
      i. their managers and leaders;
      ii. their dissidents and protestors.
3. command system vulnerabilities and resultant error probabilities:
   a. human error;
      i. unwarranted preemption (i.e., Type I error, loss of negative control);
      ii. failures of retaliatory "nerve."
   b. system error;
      i. hardware failure (i.e., Type I, loss of negative control);
      ii. systemic failure under attack (i.e., Type II error, loss of positive control);
      iii. negative and positive control inherently contradictory.
   c. intrinsic destabilizing effects of, e.g., "launch under attack" strategies—concomitant cumulative likelihood of "nuclear war by error";
   d. incalculability of errors generated by extra-systemic (i.e., non USSR-USA) use of nuclear weapons (e/g/. terrorists, opponents in "local" wars)—concomitant cumulative likelihood of "nuclear war by error";
      i. the proliferation problem.
4. philosophical (and other) conundra—e.g., "better Red than dead"—real or imaginary?

NOTES

VII. Visions of the future:

1. a scarred planet.
2. a world without weapons.

VIII. Ethical and moral questions:

1. religious questions, religious definitions.
   a. "humanism."
2. political questions, political definitions.
3. questions of "responsibility."
   a. government versus individual;
   b. responsibility to whom?
   c. active responsibility versus "failure to act."
   d. "mistakes."

NOTES

IX. Conflict theory, war, sociology:

1. the levels question.

NOTES

SCHEDULE OF ASSIGNMENTS

Week 1, 10 January:

Craig: "Why do animals fight?"
Schellenberg: 3-145.

Week 2, 17 January:

McLean: (complete).
Shils-Janowitz: "Cohesion and disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II."

18 January (Wednesday): Films.

Week 3, 24 January:

Duster: "conditions for guilt-free massacre."
Opton: "It never happened and besides they deserved it."
Smelser: "Some determinants of destructive behavior."
Webb: (complete).

25 January (Wednesday): Films.

Week 4, 31 January:

Bender: (complete, do exercises).

Mini examination 1 distributed, 2 February.

Week 5, 7 February:

Wieseltier: (complete).
8 February (Wednesday): Film.

Mini exam 1 due 7 February; questions for midterm due 9 February.

Week 6, 14 February:

Zuckerman: (complete).

15 February (Wednesday): Films.

Midterm distributed 16 February.

Week 7, 21 February:

Meyer: "A ready land force."
Sivard: (complete. Become an "expert" on one "rich" and one "poor" country.)

Midterm due 21 February.

Week 8, 28 February:

Fallows: (complete).

MIDTERM RETURNED THIS WEEK—7 MARCH IS THE LAST DAY TO DROP WITH AUTOMATIC W.

Questions for Mini 2 due 2 March.

Week 9, 6 March:

Coalition for Peace Thrcugh Strength: "Why we need a common sense plan of action for our survival as a free nation."
Fischer: "Conceptual models, judgment, and the treatment of uncertainty in nuclear threat assessment."
Jastrow: "Why strategic superiority matters."
Moral Majority: "Special briefing opposing an immediate nuclear freeze."
Novosti: "Argument on the nuclear brink."
Steinbruner: "Launch under attack."
Tetlock: "Policymakers' images of international conflict."

7 March (Wednesday): Films.

7 MARCH—LAST DAY TO DROP WITH AUTOMATIC W.

Mini 2 distributed 8 March.

SPRING RECESS

Week 10, 20 March:

Beres, et al: "Civil defense in the nuclear age."
Center for Defense Information: "Militarizing the last frontier: the space weapons race."
Ehrlich, et al: "Long-term biological consequences of nuclear war."
Turco, et al: "Nuclear winter: global consequences of multiple nuclear explosions."

21 March (Wednesday): Films.

Mini exam 2 due 20 March; questions for Mini 3 due 22 March.

Week 11, 27 March:

Levi: (complete).

Mini examination 3 distributed 29 March.

Week 12, 3 April:

Shute: (begin).

4 April (Wednesday): Films.

Mini examination 3 due 3 April; questions for Mini 4 due 5 April.

Week 13, 10 April:

Schellenberg: 147-201.
Shute: (finish).

11 April (Wednesday): Firebreaks?

Mini exam 4 distributed 12 April.

Week 14, 17 April only:

Grimshaw: "Government and social violence: the complexity of guilt."
Powers: "What is it about?"

NO CLASS 19 APRIL.

Mini exam 4 due 17 April; questions for Mini 5 due same day.

Week 15, 24 April only:

Mini exam 5 may be picked up on 24 April and turned in any time up to the end of the regularly scheduled final examination period for this class (4:30-6:30 P.M., Thursday, 26 April); reading evaluation forms are due 24 April.

FILM SERIES

War, like language, appears to be a uniquely human phenomenon, unshared by other species on our planet. Like language, it also appears to be taken as a given in human life, as something natural to the human condition. The threat of nuclear extinction, which hangs like a cloud over all of us, is also sometimes taken-for-granted, as something over which we have no control. The fact is, of course, that there are people for whom war, whether "conventional" or "nuclear," is a central feature of life—either because they live in world areas afflicted by armed struggle—or, as is the case with the leaders of governments of major world powers and military leaders, they bear the awesome responsibilities for maintenance of the fragile nuclear peace. Some ordinary citizens have made it their business to learn about war in order to find out what they can themselves do to reduce its likelihood. One way of learning is to examine the claims and counterclaims about the causes, costs, and nature of war as presented in visual media.

In the century since the motion picture camera was invented, millions of feet of film have been taken to document actual wars and to fictionally interpret them. More recently, hundreds of thousands of video tape have been recorded. These materials are sometimes collected primarily for historical documentation— as is the case of combat photography, or of the recording of surrenders and treaty-signings. Sometimes they are used, like football or basketball "game films," to improve performance. A substantial proportion of filmed material on war is intended to educate and/or persuade or, more dispassionately, to provide information from which viewers can make their own inferences. If we agree with the intended message(s), we call the films educational—if we disagree, we call them propaganda. Even those materials which are purportedly for entertainment are likely to have some sort of "slant."

The films and tapes listed in the schedule following were chosen to represent fictional and nonfictional portrayals of war phenomena and differing levels of claimed "objectivity." They are variously intended to justify war and to characterize it as insane; they show shifting patterns of alliances. They have been produced by our government, by profit-making film companies, by television news organizations, and by pro- and anti-disarmament interest groups. They vary in degrees of subtlety. They are being shown to stimulate thinking and discussion—not as representations of "truth."

The film series is a part of a regularly scheduled course, S101, War as a social problem. Admission is by season ticket only. Some tickets will be available for non-class members; they are available in the office of the Institute for Social Research, 1022 East Third Street. For information call 335-3633.

SCHEDULE OF FILMS, SPRING, 1984
(All films will be shown in Ballantine 013, beginning at 7:00 PM)

DATE	FILM(S)
18 January	Culloden (72 minutes)
	Wargame (49 minutes)
25 January	Frontline (52 minutes)
	Hiroshima-Nagasaki—August, 1945 (16 minutes)
	Blessed are the peacemakers
8 February	"SNEAK PREVIEW"
15 February	Know your enemy—Japan (63 minutes)
	Call to arms (60 minutes)
7 March	Obedience (50 minutes)
	Nuremberg (76 minutes)
21 March	Ground Zero (60 minutes)
	Last epidemic (36 minutes)
	In the nuclear shadow (25 minutes)
4 April	War machine (60 minutes)
	Dr. Strangelove (93 minutes)

ATTACHMENT 3: COURSE EXAMINATIONS

Each of the examinations carried the following "preface":

This is a "take-home" examination and you may use any sources you find useful in preparing your answers. If you quote directly you should use quotation marks. If you quote or paraphrase extensively you should provide a reference (no more than a name is necessary) to the source used. The paper should be typed if possible and should run to no more than the equivalent of 2.5-3 double-spaced pages. If you write your answers, please write in pen and on one side only of the page. You may discuss the questions with other students (or with me) but you must write your own answers independently — it is not fair (or smart) to give or receive help.

(The instructions were essentially the same for the midterm, more choices were required and more space was allowed for answering. Questions marked * are student questions or constructed from student questions.)

MINI EXAM 1

Answer one of the following:

A. Schellenberg identifies three general causative perspectives on human aggression and violence (i.e., "social Darwinism," the social psychology of interests, and the conflict sociology of Karl Marx) and three more specific interpretations for both domestic violence and war (i.e., the deprivation or frustration model, a social disorganization perspective, and the power-mobilization approach). Take one perspective from each set, and:

(1) briefly outline its principal arguments (and evidence);

(2) show the elationships between your two choices (include attention to both complementary support and contradictions);

(3) identify dimensions of conflict phenomena not easily explained by "your" theory.

B. Is war an inevitable feature of human life? Is conflict? Defend your answer (using materials from the course, not just your "own ideas"— which are also welcome). Identify the bases for contrary conclusions.

MIDTERM

ANSWER ONE QUESTION IN EACH SET

Answer one (1) of the following:

A. Who fights wars? In your answer you should attend to: (1) changes in patterns historically; (2) the combatant-noncombatant-civilian distinction; (3) conscription and voluntary recruitment; (4) the effects of modern technology; (5) contemporary cross-national variations and (6) other dimensions shown by your reading (or discussion) to be critical.

B. How and why do people fight once they are in military organizations? In considering such questions as fighting effectiveness, morale, etc., you will want to draw on your reading (MacLean, Shils-Janowitz, Webb) and possibly on films you have seen and/or materials reviewed in class.

Answer one
(1) of the following:

C. Why, according to the sources reproduced in Bender, is there an arms race? What criteria does Bender propose for evaluating the different arguments? How would the originators of the several statements evaluate one another on these criteria? How do you evaluate them? Document your evaluation from materials in the text. Do you feel you now know why there is an arms race? Explain.

D. What does Zuckerman mean by "nuclear illusion and reality?" What is his position on disarmament? How does he support his arguments? How does he score on the criteria outlined by Bender?

Answer one (1) of the following: (neither of these questions is an invitation to "slice bologna")

E. Discuss some of the ways in which war can be said to be a 'social problem." What does it mean to talk about "social policy" on war? What constituencies are involved in discussions about such policies? Who makes policies?

F. As a member of a debate team, you have been assigned the affirmative position for the proposition, "War is necessary for human progress." Identify arguments in support of the proposition and provide documentation. Suggest two or three counter-arguments and how you might respond to them.

Answer one

G. Outline the four principal critical dimensions Bender suggests should be considered in evaluating opposing (or different) viewpoints. Using those criteria select TWO of the following films which seem to you to contrast sharply on the dimensions. Defend your selection and EVALUATE THE FILMS BY THE CRITERIA.

BLESSED ARE THE PEACEMAKERS

CALL TO ARMS

HIROSHIMA-NAGASAKI

KNOW YOUR ENEMY—JAPAN

H. What are "atrocities?" Who decides when an atrocity has been been committed? Is there agreement on when an atrocity has been committed? Can the same vent sometimes be labeled an atrocity and othertimes not? Why? Why do atrocities occur? Is the definition of "atrocity" stable? Why, or why not?

MINI EXAM 2

Answer one

A. What does Sivard mean when she says the arms race is "doubly dangerous?" What evidence does she provide? In what sorts of countries are people most hurt? Why? What evidence is there for her/your conclusion? How does Sivard score on Bender's criteria?

B. What is Fallows' position on national defense? What, according to him, are we doing wrong? What are the roles of "managers, magicians, employees and theologians"? What does Fallows think we should be doing? Why are we not doing it? How does Fallow score on Bender's criteria?

C. What are "war crimes"? Who gets tried for them, and by whom? How do those charged defend themselves? Which, if any, of their defenses are reasonable? What does your conclusion on this imply? What differences are there, again if any, between "war crimes" and "atrocities"? How do the two films (NUREMBERG and OBEDIENCE, ADG) score on Bender's criteria?

MINI EXAM 3

Answer one of the following:

1. What is CRP and what are arguments pro and con (Beres, et al)? How do participants in the argument score on Bender's criteria? What implications do the conclusions of research on "nuclear winter" have for

the argument on CRP?*

2. What, according to reading and other course materials, are likely short and longer-term consequences of a major nuclear exchange? What is the principal reason scientists are uncertain about the exact nature of these consequences? What are possible dangers of underestimating risks? What do some "theologians" (in Fallows' sense) fear are dangers of OVERestimating risks?*

3. What, according to Fischer, are the four major approaches to "nuclear threat assessment"? What are their conceptual bases? What are their theoretical and/or empirical shortcomings? What is the role of judgment and sensitivity in the several approaches? What implications do Bender's criteria have for evaluating the approaches?

4. How do ordinary citizens (of varying socio-economic characteristics) appear to assess the nuclear threat? Why do some people seem to feel more threatened than others? What sorts of variables are influential in determining individual attitudes and behaviors related to the threat? CAN individuals influence the likelihood of nuclear disaster? Why, or why not? Suggest some evidence.*

MINI EXAM 4

Answer <u>one</u> of the following:

1. In Chapter 15, under "The Dream of Reason," Schellenberg discusses judicial proceedings as a way to settle conflicts. Do you think this could work on the world (international level)? Why, or why not? What recent event(s) might make us skeptical about prospects for success? How might effective courts be set up?*

2. Schellenberg also discusses "game theory." What is it; could it be used to predict decisions about the likelihood of nuclear war? Has it been so used? What criticisms are made of the theory? What elements of game theory can be useful in understanding the real world of decision-making?*

3. What arguments does Levi make in concluding that the likelihood of war may be declining? What elements of the current world situation seem to support of contradict his position? What implications does the current controversy over Soviet participation in the Olympics in Los Angeles have for Levi's position? How would he respond?

4. Is it possible to relate the positions of characters in the film Dr. Strangelove (even though the characters portrayed are exaggerated) to positions and attitudes of today's leaders? If so, how? Is the Doomsday machine believable today? Why, or why not? Could a war start today as it did in the fictional treatment? Why or why not? Why do we laugh at the movie? What are its serious aspects (if any)?*

MINI EXAM 5

Answer one of the following:

A. Your first exam included a question on whether or not war is an inevitable feature of human life. Many of the materials in this course have attended, with varying degrees of explicitness and directness, to this inevitability issue; I hope you have given some thought to the question. Armed with your new resources of knowledge, comment on the inevitability of: (1) interpersonal conflict; (2) group conflict; (3) war; (4) nuclear war. You may state your own opinions and you may use materials not assigned in the course—YOUR ANSWER SHOULD DEMONSTRATE FAMILIARITY WITH COURSE MATERIALS.

B. As you know, both from current news and from materials in this course, many governments oppress their own citizens and military forces often commit atrocities against the citizens of occupied territories and/or against members of opposing military forces. What action can (should?) outside countries take about such oppression or atrocities? What constraints are there on such action? What action can (should?) individual citizens take? In what way can it be said that governments or individual citizens are "responsible" (or not) for oppression and/or atrocities in other countries? It may be helpful to draw on one or two actual cases (e.g., Afghanistan, El Salvador, Iran-Iraq, Lebanon, Libya-Chad, Nazi Germany, Nicaragua, Poland, South Africa, Timor, Uganda, USA [Native Americans], USA [slavery], Vietnam) for illustrative documentation of your arguments.*

C. We spent quite a bit of time in class discussing different types of response to the threat of nuclear war; we also discussed how individuals who have one response set may come to have another. What are some of the types we identified? Which do you think you are? How did you come to have the response you now have? What sorts of events might change your position? How can a balance be achieved between non-immobilizing concern, terror and apathy? What might be the role of institutions (i.e., education, family, government, the media, religion, etc.) in helping individuals achieve such balance?*

ATTACHMENT 5: QUESTIONS ON FILMS

(The questions were distributed at the time the films were shown. Films are listed here in approximately the order students saw them.)

CULLODEN

1. Leadership, logistics and "belief in a cause" all contribute to success or failure in battle. What were the strengths and weaknesses on these dimensions of the opposing forces at Culloden? What advantages that the Highlanders might have had were wasted?

2. It is sometimes said that winners define war crimes. What does Culloden tell us about such a claim?

3. Civil war and internal rebellions are often particularly bitter conflicts. Why is this so? Was it true of Culloden? Has it been true of American wars? Which?

4. What, if anything, does Culloden tell us about the strengths and weaknesses of volunteer and conscript armies? What is the difference between "feudal" conscription and the modern "draft"? Are "volunteers" always better soldiers? Why or why not?

5. Was war a social problem in 1746? Why or why not?

WARGAME

1. Do you think the film is realistic? Why, or why not? Is it more or less realistic now than it might have been fifteen years ago? Why?

2. Was the war which resulted in the events depicted in the film intended or accidental? Could such a war happen today? Why, or why not?

3. Do you think {American could/would act in the way survivors did in the film? How could such a breakdown in the social order be prevented? Do you think a nuclear war will be "survivable" for people living in Indianapolis? Bloomington? Nashville?

4. If bombing of military targets in the United States resulted in the kind of situation portrayed in the film, would you want our government to "retaliate"? What retaliation would be appropriate?

5. In what ways has the nature of war as a social problem changed between the time of Culloden and today?

FRONTLINE

1. Leadership, logistics and "belief in a cause" all contribute to success or failure in battle. What were the strengths and weaknesses on these dimensions of the opposing forces in Vietnam?

2. What similarities and differences were there between the attitudes of civilian populations (British and Highlanders in Culloden; American, North Vietnamese, Viet Cong and South Vietnamese in Vietnam)? What effects may these differences have had on the outcomes of the two conflicts?

3. It is sometimes said that winners define war crimes. What does Vietnam tell us about this claim.

4. Do you think the film presents an objective picture of the war in Vietnam? Why, or why not? What would make a presentation on Vietnam more objective?

5. Was war a social problem for Vietnam? In what ways? What about the United States?

HIROSHIMA-NAGASAKI

1. Is this film objective? Why or why not?

2. The bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was planned, deliberate, intentional. Would a nuclear war today be the same? Why? Why not?

3. What differences were there between the devastation produced in the nuclear bombing of Japan and that resulting from contemporary "conventional" war? What about "carpet bombing" in Vietnam?

4. What does Hiroshima-Nagasaki tell us about the claim about winners defining war crimes?

5. How is bombing, nuclear or "conventional," different from ground combat?

BLESSED ARE THE PEACEMAKERS

1. Is this film objective? Why or why not? Do the filmmakes distinguish between fact and opinion? How?

2. What is the basic argument of the film? Do you agree? Why, or why not? If you agree, what is the film's most convincing argument? If you do not, what makes it unconvincing to you?

3. What do the filmakers consider to be the greatest risk to the contemporary risk to the contemporary world? Comment.

4. How would the kinds of arguments made in the film be viewed by participants (and others affected) in Culloden? Vietnam?

5. Do all religious Americans agree with the position of the film? What are the bases of their disagreement(s), if there is (are) any?

AMONG THE WILD CHIMPANZEES

1. Do the chimpanzees have warfare?

2. Do the chimpanzees have aggression?

3. Is this film objective?

4. What questions, if any, does CHIMPS raise about the nature-nurture argument? What answers does it suggest? Would the film cause Craig to change HIS argument? Why or why not?

5. Are there chimpanzee criminals?

THE BOAT

1. Leadership, logistics and "belief in a cause" all contribute to success or failure in battle. What were the strengths and weaknesses on these dimensions of the crew of "the Boat"? Of the German submarine war effort? Does this fictional account support or contradict the Shils-Janowitz research? Explain.

2. Did submariners commit atrocities? How did they define their enemy? How does their experience compare with that of Americans accused of atrocities in Vietnam?

3. The Germans were our enemies in World War II. Why did you find yourself sympathizing with the crew of "the Boat""?

4. How did the crew of H.M.S. Ulysses THEIR enemy? What about the officers? In what ways are these attitudes defined by the nature of sea warfare as contrasted to ground combat? Bombing?

5. Is this film objective? What can it mean to ask whether a fictional film is objective?

KNOW YOUR ENEMY—JAPAN

1. The catalog listing of this film notes, "This film is considered of historical value and does necessarily reflect current policy or plans of the Department of Defense." Why?

2. Is this film objective? Why or why not? How do you suppose Germans were portrayed when this film was made? How are the Japanese currently portrayed? How about the Russians?

3. What are some of the implications of your answers to the questions above to an understanding of the articles by Duster, Opton and Smelser on atrocities?

4. How effective would the film have been in increasing the willingness of American military personnel to fight? How effective would the film likely have been in improving morale? (IN thinking about this question, keep in mind the other films you have seen—and such reading as Webb and Shils-Janowitz.)

5. How much are the Japanese in this film like those in Hiroshima-Nagasaki? What are the differences, and what are the sources of the differences?

CALL TO ARMS

1. How does this film compare in objectivity to others you have seen? Which others is it most like on this dimension? Most unlike? What is the basis of your judgment?

2. What is the principal purpose of this film? Does it draw conclusions? Do you agree?

3. What are the reasons for "GI" haircuts?

4. What does this film tell us about who fights, how they are chosen, and the willingness and motivation of American military personnel to fight?

5. What inferences about the likelihood of nuclear war can be made from this report on U.S. conventional forces?

THE LAST EPIDEMIC

1. What, according to the film, would be the effects of detonation of nuclear weapons on cities? According to your reading, does the film either over or under-estimate the likely damage?

2. What is the basis of the observation that the "survivors" of a nuclear bombing would "envy the dead"?

3. HIROSHIMA-NAGASAKI reports on actual nuclear bombings in 1945. WARGAME is a speculative film on effects of a nuclear war in the mid 1960s. THE LAST EPIDEMIC is also speculative; it deals with projected effects of nuclear weapons in the 1980s. What changes in probable effects of nuclear warfare have occurred over this forty year period?

4. Look back at the questions on HIROSHIMA-NAGASAKI. What implications do those questions—and your answers—have for response to THIS film? How would the questions need to be reformulated today?

GROUND ZERO

1. How powerful and how accurate is a Minuteman MIRV? What does THIS imply for earlier characterizations of nuclear war seen and read about in this course?

2. What is the "triad"? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the

several "legs"?

3. How do those responsible for missile launching (or other varieties of nuclear attack) feel about their jobs? How do they make an adjustment to the possible duty of unleashing mass obliteration on distant humans? To what other social processes are these adjustments related?

4. What is "launch on warning"? What are pro and con arguments on the policy?

5. Is GROUND ZERO objective reporting? How do those interviewed (or whose positions are simply reproduced) score on Bender's criteria? What does the film say about "national security"? How does it affect your sense of PERSONAL security?

IN THE NUCLEAR SHADOW

1. How do the children in this film feel about nuclear war? What do they fear? Do you think the children are typical? Why, or why not? Do you know children who feel the same way? People your own age? Older people? Why do you suppose some people, of all ages, experience more fear about the nuclear threat than others do?

2. Do you think the children are irrational in their fear? Do you think adults have irresponsibly contributed to the childrens' fear? Would it be better to "protect" children from knowledge of the nuclear threat? Do you think this could be done?

3. Would you want to show this film to children you know? Why or why not? Adults?

ATTACHMENT 5: EVALUATION FORM

S101 READING LIST EVALUATION (SPRING, 1984)

Your Evaluation of the Readings will be used to revise the reading list the next time the course is taught. Please answer frankly.

	Careful Reading	Skim, Part Read	Not Read	Liked It	Neutral	Didn't Like	Boring	Too Hard	Other--Please Explain
First, the purchased texts, in order of assignment:									
Schellenberg, The Science of Conflict									
McLean, H.M.S. Ulysses									
Webb, Fields of Fire									
Bender, The Arms Race: Opposing Viewpoints									
Wieseltier, Nuclear War, Nuclear Peace									
Zuckerman, Nuclear Illusion and Reality									
Sivard, World Military and Social Expenditures									
Fallows, National Defense									
Levi, The Coming End of War									
Shute, On the Beach									
Second, Other Readings, In order of Assignment:									
Craig, "Why Do Animals Fight?"									
Shils-Janowitz, "Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmact"									
Duster, "Conditions for Guilt-free Massacre"									
Optor, "It never happened and besides they deserved it"									
Smelser, "Some Determinants of Destructive Behavior"									
Meyer, "A Ready Land Force"									

	Careful Reading	Skim,Part Read	Not Read	Liked It	Neutral	Didn't Like	Boring	Too Hard	Other--Please Explain
Coalition for Peace, "Why We Need a Common Sense Plan for Action for Our Survival as a Free Nation"									
Fischer, "Conceptural Models, Judgment, and the Treatment of Uncertainty in Nuclear Threat Assessment"									
Jastrow, "Why Strategic Superiority Matters"									
Moral Majority, "Special Briefing Opposing an Immediate Nuclear Freeze"									
Novosti, "Argument on the Nuclear Brink"									
Steinbruner, "Launch Under Attack"									
Tetlock, "Policymakers Images of International Conflict"									
Bertes Et.Al "Civil Defense in the Nuclear Age"									
Center for Defense Information, "Militarizing the Last Frontier: The Space Weapons Race"									
Ehrlich Et.al, A Long-term Biological Consequences of Nuclear War"									
Turco et.al, "Nuclear Winter: Global Consequences of Multiple Nuclear Explosions"									
Grimshaw, "Government and Social Violence: The Complexity of Guilt"									
Powers, "What is it About?"									

Lastly, The Films, In order of Assignment	Watched It	Watched Part of It	Didn't Watch	Liked It	Neutral	Don't Like	Boring	Didn't Compre-Hend it	Other-Please Explain
Culloden									
Frontline									
Wargame									
Hiroshima-Nagasaki									
Blessed Are the Peacemakers									
Sneak Preview: The Boat									
Know Your Enemy - Japan									
Call to Arms									
Obedience									
Nuremberg									
Ground Zero									
Last Epidemic									
In the Nuclear Shadow									
War Machine									
Dr. Strangelove									

FINALLY:

(1) What three books did you like the most?

(2) What three books did you like the least? (and why)

(3) What three readings did you like the most?

(4) What three readings did you like the least? (and why)

(5) What three films did you like the most?

(6) What three films did you like the least? (and why)

(7) Comments on Books, Readings or Films?

_____

Name (Print)

ATTACHMENT 6: PSR LETTER

(Summer, 1983)

Ms. E. J. Graff, Associate Director
Publications and Research
Physicians for Social Responsibility
639 Mass. Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dear Ms. Graff:

Thank you for your sympathetic letter of June 28.

I have talked to people in our library about your suggestion that I request that the library take out an institutional subscription for PSR publications. Your librarian friends are correct in their observation that high priority is given to faculty requests. Unless they are working in libraries with very substantial endowments, however (which may be the case in Cambridge!), they will also tell you that library budgets are being squeezed by inflation and that libraries are reluctant to purchase newsletters and materials which will end up in "vertical" files, i.e., loose articles, pamphlets, etc. At this juncture, the Indiana University library is having trouble with its book budget, and is faced with the continuing prospects of having to pare rather than increase its serials list. While our librarians are sympathetic to teaching needs, they are understandably reluctant to make commitments for purchase of fugitive materials. I will continue to pursue the matter, I am not optimistic.

I have three suggestions about matters which you and your colleagues in publications and research might want to discuss with one another and perhaps with the PSR executive and, ultimately national advisory board.

1. student rates: As I noted, one of my reasons for interest in the newsletter is for use in teaching. There are serials (newsletters, newspapers, news magazines, etc.) which offer special subscription rates for students. Such rates are sometimes in the form of bulk orders, sent to instructors and distributed in class, sometimes in the form of short-term subscriptions (i,.e., for the period of course enrollment), sometimes in the form of reduced rates for the full period of student status, sometimes for a year term beginning with a period of class enrollmen. Such arrangements have obvious costs, both in a lower return per unit and in increased administrative expense. They also can have substantial benefits, however, in that they put the serial in the hands of potential "regular" subscribers who might otherwise not see it, increase total circulation, and reach a potentially important constituency. Students become voters; some become decision- makers. I think it can be argued that some such policy would contribute both to the educaticnal goals of PSR and, over the longer course, to its political and financial bases. The idea should, at least, be worth some discussion.

2. "teacher rates": A number of serials, both those published for profit (i.e., Wall Street Journal, Time), and for educational purposes, provide either reduced rates (or, in some few instances, free subscriptions) to teachers (at both the college and secondary levels) actually offering instruction in their area of focus. There are several hundred college and university level courses on war and peace topics; the World Conflicts Section of the American Sociological Association and similar organizations are trying to encourage the both the growth of such instruction and the introduction of materials on these topics to other courses (in the case of sociology, introductory principles and social problems courses and upper level substantive courses). There are, as you know, dozens of organizations in the peace movement, many with publications they would like to circulate as widely as possible. It will be obvious that few high school or college teachers can afford to subscribe to all this material. I can certainly understand your concern "to avoid setting a precedent for cut-rate subscriptions," I simply suggest that there may be other important considerations. I very much doubt, moreover, that many of your subscribers (given that they share PSR and all our goals) would be distressed by an attempt to make your materials more accessible to student and faculty constituencies. Again, I think this idea should at least be worth discussion.

3. exchange arrangements: The WCS publishes a newsletter; it is considerably more modest in coverage and considerably less impressive in format than that of the PSR. Many other organizations, both scholarly (and/or professional) and activist, also publish serials of one sort or another. While some of these organizations may not share beliefs about optimal methods, most do share a common concern for peace. They also share a common need for maximizing access to information. Wouldn't it make sense for all of us to share information by exchanging publications. The cost would be minimal (postage and some modest book-keeping); the gains in available information might be quite considerable. There are also precedents for such arrangements in both profit and non-for-profit publishing. Once again, I would submit that such an idea is at least worth discussion.

As I think I told you in my earlier letter, I do not expect to begin teaching my projected course on war as a social problem until spring of 1984. I am continuing in my regimen of reading; I am also continuing my search for optimally useful teaching materials. I would be most interested to learn about the response of you and your colleagues to the kinds of arrangements I have suggested in this letter. I will discuss them with my WCS colleagues. If you and your colleagues at PSR find the suggestions have merit, I will undertake to explore similar possibilities with other peace-oriented organizations.

Thank you for your supportive comments about the ASA "editorial." I will hope to hear from you with a response to this letter. In the meantime, best wishes in your own continuing and important efforts.

PEACE!